

with his view the attributes of personality. These he conceived as being indissolubly connected with the limitations of human persons. Throughout the whole of his philosophy he never adopted that term as expressive of his deepest and highest religious conviction, however much he may have gradually found a philosophical expression for the moral Truths of the Christian religion.

If we now inquire how Fichte, in addition to the religious problem which directed all his thought, dealt with the more technical philosophical problem, the unification of thought or knowledge, we find that he takes up Kant's position. But instead of asking, how is experience possible? he puts the deeper question, how is consciousness or self-consciousness possible? And while Kant's first answer to his question was, "by the unity of apperception," Fichte put the question more pertinently, how is this unity of apperception or of consciousness possible, *i.e.*, thinkable and intelligible? And the answer which he gave to this question was: "through an original act or activity." He thus at once seized upon the link between the unity of the theoretical and that of the practical reason, which in Kant's system was indeed suggested but not clearly and consistently established. At the same time he threw overboard, as unnecessary and misleading, the idea of an additional external unity of the "Thing in itself," which had remained as a limiting idea in Kant's system.¹

¹ The fundamental practical idea first clearly stated by Fichte, that a moral purpose must form the explanation of every satisfactory

analysis of the stages and development, not only of practical, but also of theoretical reason, has survived and come forward again and